



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/518,349	03/03/2000	Cary Lane Rohwer	ST9-99-128	5134

25696 7590 01/07/2003

OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY
P. O. BOX 10356
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER

CHOUDHARY, ANITA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 01/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/518,349

Applicant(s)

ROHWER, CARY LANE

Examiner

Anita Choudhary

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 March 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 9 objected to because of the following informalities:

The wording in claim 9, 27, and 44 line 3 is confusing. It is not clear what “with a corresponding encoder one of the media servers” means. Request for clarification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim 1-4, 19- 22 and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sequeira (US Patent 6,222,530).

Art Unit: 2153

Sequeira shows a system and method for a master scheduler for assisting client in viewing stored media at scheduled times. In referring to claim 1:

- Master Scheduler node (fig. 1, 120) receives information input by user specifying a selected one of the media servers for scheduling operations to be performed (col. 3 line 60 –col. 4 line col. 5 line 5).
- Displaying graphical information indicative of a current local time at said selected media server (fig. 6 col. 14 lines 4-27).

In referring to claim 2, 20 and 38, Sequeria shows:

- The displaying of GUI at node including a plurality of interface components enabling a user to specify and schedule operations to be performed by selected ones of the media servers (col. 5 lines 38- col. 7 lines 15).
- The receiving of information input by the user specifying an operation to be performed by the selected media server, and a schedule for performing the operations (col. 14 lines 4-49).

In referring to claim 3, 21, and 39, Sequeria shows a media storage device attached to media server for storing media data. User is enabled to select preferred media from said attached media storage device corresponding to selected media server (fig. 1 item 160, col. 4 lines 7-13, col. 8 line 57- col. 8 line 5).

In referring to claim 4, 22, and 40, Sequeria shows the network being IP network (col. 4 lines 39-47, col. 10 lines 14-18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 5, 6, 23, 24, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sequeria in view of Lindblad et al.

Although Sequeria shows substantial features of the claimed invention, Sequeria does not explicitly show an applet being sent to terminal. Nonetheless an applet being sent to terminal via network is well known and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Sequeria as evidenced by Lindblad.

Lindblad teaches as video on demand applet method for access to multimedia documents. In referring to claim 5 and 23, Lindblad shows applet transmitted to terminal via network for display in at terminal window (col. 3 lines 25-48, col. 5 lines 5-26).

Given the teachings of Lindblad, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantages of modifying Sequeria by using an applet in order to request and control multimedia document streams from video server.

In referring to claim 6, 24, and 41 Lindblad shows multicasting operations for streaming media to terminals, and the encoding of media data (col. 8 lines 1-9, col. 6 lines 25-29).

Claim 7, 8, 25, 26, 42, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sequeria in view of Maskowitz et al.

Art Unit: 2153

Sequeria show substantial features of the claimed invention including:

- Display a source selection interface enabling user to select a source location, resulting in receiving information input by user (col. 6 lines 41-51, fig 3A item 310)
- Displaying an asset list and receiving input by user (col. 10 lines 14-40 fig. 32A 3201g).

Sequeria does not show destination selection interface of assets being portions.

Nonetheless these features are well known and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Sequeria as evidenced by Moskowitz.

In an analogous art, Moskowitz teaches a viewer controllable on demand multimedia service having:

- Allowing user to arrange the delivery of media data to a destination device (col. 4 lines 10-20, 55-60).

Given the teachings of Moskowitz, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages to modifying the Sequeira with a destination selection component as disclosed by Moskowitz in order serve a selected media event to a virtually unlimited number of subscribers.

In regards to claim 8, 26 and 43, Sequeria shows displaying scheduled copy interface components enabling user to select a start time and date for copying, and generating a copy command associated with the start time and date of selected source (fig. 7 col. 14 lines 28-32).

Art Unit: 2153

Claim 9-16, 27-34, and 44-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sequeria in view of Lindblad in further view of Morris.

Although Sequeria in view of Lindblad show substantial features of the claimed invention, they do not show a multimedia device operative to generate multimedia data. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Sequeria in view of Lindblad as evidenced by Morris.

In analogous art, Morris shows method and system for allowing control of multimedia device over a network.

In referring to claim 9, 27, and 44, Morris shows a multimedia device operative to generate media data, such device linked to server (col. 15 lines 36- col. 16 line 25).

Given the teachings of Morris a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages to modifying the Sequeria in view of Lindblad with a multimedia device to generate the media data in order to allow remote access and control of media devices for the purposes of imaging and surveillance applications.

In referring to claim 10, 28, and 45 Sequeria shows a display interface for enabling user to select a start time and date for encoding of operations (fig. 7 col. 14 lines 28-32). Lindblad further shows the encoding of such requested data associated with client request (col. 6 lines 18-32).

In referring to claim 11, 29, and 46, Sequeria shows a first option of selecting stop date and time, and second option including duration and start time (fig. 32A/B, col. 21 lines 15-30).

Art Unit: 2153

In referring to claim 12, 30, and 47, Sequeria shows the recording of media data to a memory location on a server, a display is used to register the client and camera (col. 15 lines 57-col. 16 line 26).

In referring to claim 13, 31, and 48, Sequeria shows a display for user to select playback destination and schedule (fig. 23, col. 19 lines 1-67).

In referring to claim 14, 32, and 49, Sequeria shows a play back schedule having a first and second group of components enabling user to selecting start time and date as well as options for play-back, (fig. 7 col. 14 lines 28-32, fig. 32A/B, col. 21 lines 15-30).

In referring to claim 15, 33, and 50, Lindblad shows loop count value for repeat of streaming of sorted media (col. 8 lines 1-9).

In referring to claim 16, 34 and 51, Sequeria shows a event notification message (col. 9 lines 33-42).

Claim 17-18, 35, 36, 52 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sequeria in view of Monterio et al.

Although Sequeria shows substantial features of the claimed invention Sequeria does not show displaying multicasting destination interface information. Nonetheless this feature is well known and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Sequeria as evidenced by Monteiro et al.

In an analogous art, Monteiro shows multicasting of media data and display of selections for multicast broadcasts (col. 16 lines 20- col. 17 line 30).

Given the teachings of Monteiro a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Sequeria by using a display for multicasting media data to a plurality of users at the same time in order carryout multi-party conferencing of data and images.

In referring to claim 18, 36, and 53, Sequeria shows a first and second group of components allowing user to select start time and date for and other options for schedule duration (fig. 7 col. 14 lines 28-32, fig. 32A/B, col. 21 liens 15-30).


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anita Choudhary whose telephone number is (703) 305-5268. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

AC
December 30, 2002



Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner